

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-27, and 29-34 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 16, 21, and 28 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 23 have been amended herein. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-29, 21-31, and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watkins, *et al.*, Applicant respectfully disagrees and believes that claim 1 as originally presented included at least one element nowhere even mentioned, much less taught by Watkins, *et al.* More specifically, claim 1 included the requirement that the width of the illuminated region on a substrate was substantially equal to the width of the feature included in the illuminated region. The Examiner asserts that col. 3, lines 41-48 of Watkins, *et al.* discloses this limitation. However, this citation discloses that Watkins, *et al.* can use a line scan camera or an area scan camera and may also include a telecentric camera lens. Applicant simply does not see any relationship between the claim limitations and col. 3, lines 41-48 of the Watkins, *et al.* reference. It is also noted that all of the independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 23 now include a similar limitation.

In addition, each of the independent claims have been further amended to include a requirement that the focal plane of the lenslet array be substantially coincident with the surface of the substrate being examined. The Examiner was of the opinion that FIGs. 1 and 3a disclosed light rays being focused *at* the substrate. However, each of the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the focal plane of the lenslet array is substantially coincident with the surface of the target substrate as shown in FIG. 2 of the replacement drawing. More specifically, the lenslets focus the plurality of light beams 220 to the locations 230 on the workpiece 120.

FIG. 2 of Watkins, *et al.* clearly shows that the focal plane of the microlens 52 is substantially coincident with apertures 51 in the aperture plate 50 not on the same "S". In fact, the whole telecentric imaging lens 46 of Watkins, *et al.* is between the array of microlens 52 and the target samples. This is clearly not taught by the Watkins, *et al.* reference.

Claims 5, 11, 20, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins, *et al.* or in view of Hendler, *et al.* on the basis that Hendler, *et al.* disclosed directing light onto the substrate at an oblique angle. However, Hendler, *et al.* does not overcome the shortcomings of the Watkins, *et al.* primary reference, and therefore these claims are also allowable.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issuance. If the Examiner should have any questions, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the appropriate fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

5 January 2006

James C. Kesterson
James C. Kesterson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 25,882

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218